

Speaking Notes for Presentation to the Subcommittee on Economic Security, Infrastructure Protection, and Cybersecurity, and the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Science, and Technology, of the United States House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security

David B. Harris

Senior Fellow for National Security
Canadian Coalition for Democracies

Bellingham, Washington
8 August 2006

My name is David Harris, and I am a Canadian lawyer. I serve as Senior National Security Fellow and Legal Advisor to the Canadian Coalition for Democracies (CCD)(<http://www.canadiancoalition.com/>). The CCD is a leading non-political, multiethnic, multid denominational Canadian human rights organization and public-policy think-tank dedicated to defending and advancing democracy and civil liberties in a secure Canada and stable world.

My previous pre- and post-9/11 statements before Congressional bodies cautioned that much would have to be done to fight Canada's drift into terror-haven status. Canada may now be emerging from the troubled period when the commitment of its past political leadership to counterterrorism was falling into doubt. I will briefly review current progress, signal the serious work yet to be accomplished, and propose certain criteria against which future achievement can be measured.

Since coming to power in January 2006, the minority Conservative Government of Stephen Harper has committed itself to confronting those who would impose terrorist warfare and subversion upon Canadian democracy and Canada's liberal-pluralist allies. Under the current Canadian regime, achievements in the struggle with extremist Islam – the predominating foreign and domestic enemy – have assumed various forms.

Abroad, Canadians are in combat on the Afghan Front, and their Government has set its face firmly against attempts to intimidate our country into withdrawal from that mission. In the terror war's Lebanese salient, the Harper Government has sponsored effective humanitarian efforts, while all the time asserting explicitly Israel's right and duty, as a sister peace-loving democracy, to end the killer-sanctuary that our Hezbollah enemy has long enjoyed under Syro-Iranian dominion of Lebanon. In this, the Canadian Prime Minister is doubtless aware of Hezbollah's record of undertaking targeting reconnaissance in Canada against Canadian sites.

At home, it is to the credit of a predecessor Liberal Government that it brought in a new, post-9/11 Anti-Terrorism Act, and the current Government has vigorously supported efforts to guarantee internal security. Indeed, the eighteenth person was last week detained in connection with an alleged largely-homegrown Toronto-area Islamic terrorist ring accused of preparing mass-casualty attacks. Accusations claim that those concerned – all of them Canadian residents, and most of them Canadian citizens – sought to use three times the explosives detonated in Timothy McVeigh's 1995 Oklahoma City outrage. Meanwhile, Crown prosecutors prepare their case for the unrelated January 2007 trial of Momin Khawaja, a young Canadian Muslim who worked for a time with our Department of Foreign Affairs, and is now claimed to have had a role in British terrorist-cell preparations.

This record reflects, in many respects, the close and successful relations maintained between Canadian security, intelligence and border authorities, and their opposite numbers in the United States.

None of this record of Ottawa's determination to confront the enemy, or my growing – but still very cautious – optimism, is to deny that the present Canadian Government has inherited a dangerous and unacceptable situation from the preceding thirteen years of federal leadership.

The Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) director some years ago first alerted us to the presence of fifty terror organizations in Canada, the second-highest number in any country after the United States, itself. In June, the Deputy Director Operations of Canada's intelligence service warned a Canadian Senate subcommittee that Canadian residents include those who are "graduates of terrorist training camps and campaigns, including experienced combatants from conflicts in Afghanistan, Bosnia, Chechnya and elsewhere." He offered that "Canadian citizens or residents have been implicated in terrorist attacks and conspiracies elsewhere in the world," some having "been involved in plots against targets in the United States, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Israel, Singapore, Pakistan and other countries."

Those interested in further details of the infiltration problem might examine my 8 June 2006 testimony before the House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security and Claims.

In any event, as Ambassador Martin Collacott indicates in his authoritative Fraser Institute study titled *Canada's Inadequate Response to Terrorism*, much of the difficult ground we now face was prepared over years through inadvertence and involved – and regrettably still involves – our deeply flawed immigration and refugee system.

In per capita terms, Canada welcomes double the number of immigrants, and three or four times the number of refugees, as the United States. This is to say that thirty-one million Canadians each year greet 250,000 immigrants. In addition, the 500 refugee

claimants of 1977 have been transformed into the 29,000 a year, of today. It is hard to conceive how Canada can effectively screen such numbers.

Let there be no mistake. Immigrants have contributed in many important ways to Canada's development. Canada stands to benefit from economic- and security-sensible management of immigration policy and flows. However, as has been decisively shown by former Canadian Ambassadors Collacott, James Bissett, and in Daniel Stoffman's book *Who Gets In*, and Diane Francis's *Immigration: The Economic Case*, that is not at all what we have got now.

Our intake numbers are so great and, in many ways, unselective, that they endanger our internal security and economic future. They are justified only by two interests. First, the industries of immigration lawyers, NGOs and settlement groups that have arisen in response to and been fuelled by the influx. And, second, political leadership that has regarded the immigration and refugee system as a vote-importing mechanism promising bloc votes from grateful newcomers and aspiring sponsors of relatives.

Canada places itself, its liberal-pluralist values, its stability, and its allies, at risk when it persists in this course at a time of liberalism's worldwide resistance struggle with Islamofascist ideology, incursion and terror. Even conceding the ostensible economic benefits of current immigration approaches, Canada's enormous immigration numbers in today's world make it difficult to prevent the arrival of intolerant, supremacist strains of Islam.

And this is what we are finding. Supremacists are undermining moderate Muslim authority figures – some of whom now assert that their lives are in danger –, hatefully distort children's perceptions of their fellow Canadians, and would at best reduce our country to a collection of hostile, anarchic warring enclaves.

Meanwhile, as in the United States, possibly Wahhabist- or Muslim Brotherhood-oriented pressure groups alienate Muslims from the mainstream and enhance their groups' grip on Islamic constituencies by issuing misleading "studies" claiming widespread anti-Islamic persecution. Carried by national news media who have signally failed in their due-diligence responsibilities to examine the history, links and agendas of the pressure groups, the publicity engendered by these reports grooms politicians and the public to accommodate fundamentalist Islamic demands. Privileges are extended in public institutions that would not be countenanced in an egalitarian society for any other religious or ideological community. A sense of fundamentalist entitlement is thereby encouraged, and the cycle of expectation-demand-concession continues, with the possibility that failure to concede will be pedaled hysterically as "Islamophobia", and draw hostile – possibly dangerous – consequences.

Given these trends, it is hardly surprising that, for a number of years, Canada's political climate was relatively accommodating to the growth of extremism. A former prime minister personally intervened to have Pakistan release the notorious patriarch of Canada's "al-Qaeda Family," the Khadr. Mr. Khadr, senior, was later killed in a

terrorist shoot-out, and a son is accused of killing a young American medic in Afghanistan. A previous government even defended Hamas' and Hezbollah's right to exist legally in Canada, and only public reaction eventually forced that government to outlaw these genocidal groups. And, days ago, certain Liberal, Bloc Québécois and New Democratic Party parliamentarians shocked the conscience of progressive thinkers by blocking moderate Canadian Lebanese from appearing, as invited, before a parliamentary committee looking at the Lebanese situation. There is growing concern that this manoeuvre was designed to appeal to certain Hezbollah-sympathetic Canadian Islamic interests who have undertaken disruptive protests lately in Canadian streets.

Indeed, photos provided by Canadian Coalition for Democracies' correspondents show the bold and confident display of Hezbollah flags and symbols at recent Montreal demonstrations. Certain of these are herewith respectfully submitted to subcommittee members as exhibits A and B to this testimony. Note that in the course of such protests in Montreal and Toronto, Hezbollah sympathizers were, in at least one case that went unreported by mainstream media, confident enough to use intimidation, while scared and outnumbered police looked on, helplessly. This, in a country whose Parliament outlawed the organization in its Criminal Code.

Against this backdrop, the new Canadian Conservative Government appears for now to be the most credible hope for Canadians – and Americans – seeking security, stability and continuing good neighbourly relations. Nonetheless, of course, shifting demographics and political pressures mean that all political leadership of whatever stripe must be watched carefully to ensure progress on the security file.

Following are the sorts of initiatives that will reflect progress in the new Canadian Government's security and counterterror efforts. In fairness to the present political leadership, it must be borne in mind that the Government's freedom of action is likely to be constrained in the short run by its minority standing in Parliament.

First, the government must regain control of the immigration and refugee system by bringing it into line with the need for public safety, economic security, and the importance of social integration and cohesion. Comprehensive adjustments must be made in pertinent law and policy. Newcomers must be given clear notice of the tolerant, liberal-democratic nature of Canadian society as defined in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and that there is no room for radical supremacism.

Second, efforts should be made to develop a common US-Canadian security perimeter, although this will require resolution of challenging issues, including those bearing on personal privacy.

Third, Canada should restrict entry to the country of Saudi Arabian money, and of radical, Saudi-trained and inspired clerics and teaching material, in order to limit sources of extreme-Wahhabist influence on our people and institutions. Private schools, religious institutions, advocacy organizations, media, and other public influencers must account for all funds that originate directly or indirectly from outside Canada. Canada must likewise

deny entry to extremist clerics and others with a history of promoting a violent or racist agenda.

Fourth, government, media and other institutions should review on an ongoing basis the origins and history, links and agendas of self-described Canadian Islamic and Canadian Arab representative organizations, in order to determine which, if any, are suitable partners for publicity, outreach, sensitivity-guidance and public-initiative purposes. Particular diligence is required on the part of police and security organizations, because radical and terror-apologist groups routinely seek involvement with security bodies in order to build credibility with other government and non-government agencies. Given the difficulties presented by proliferating, well-funded Islamist influence organizations, authorities should, where any doubt exists, prefer contact with individual Muslim moderates, rather than with collective organizations. This is important where organizations that have been vocal in national security debates habitually avoid condemning by name enemy Islamic terror groups like Hamas, Hezbollah and Palestinian Islamic Jihad.

In conclusion, let me say that Canada appears not to be altogether the same country that it was at the end of 2005. Recent developments suggest that the new Canadian administration, despite its minority status, has been firm in deciding that North American security and a principled foreign policy, are among its highest priorities. Millions of Canadians hope that the current United States administration will recognize this change. Your friends and allies to the north especially trust that United States security measures will reflect and support the new, more constructive attitude that Ottawa seems to have adopted in relation to security and our common defence.

Thank-you for inviting me today, and I await any questions Subcommittee members might have.

Contact: David B. Harris, 613.233.1220; insignissr@sympatico.ca